arXiv:1403.2038v4 [hep-ph] 24 Nov 2015

Constrained analytical interrelations in neutrino mixing

Biswajoy Brahmachari*
Department of Physics, Vidyasagar Evening College
39, Sankar Ghosh Lane, Kolkata 700006
and
Probir Roy†
Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics
Block AF, Bidhannagar, Kolkata 700064
and
CAPPS, Bose Institute, Kolkata 700091

November 2015

To be published in Springer Proceedings in the Physics Series
under the heading of the XXI DAE-BRNS Symposium (Guwahati, India)

Abstract

Hermitian squared mass matrices of charged leptons and light neutrinos in the flavor basis are studied under general additive lowest order perturbations away from the tribimaximal (TBM) limit in which a weak basis with mass diagonal charged leptons is chosen. Simple analytical expressions are found for the three measurable TBM-deviants in terms of perturbation parameters appearing in the neutrino and charged lepton eigenstates in the flavor basis. Taking unnatural cancellations to be absent and charged lepton perturbation parameters to be small, interrelations are derived among masses, mixing angles and the amount of CP-violation.

*biswa.brahmac@gmail.com
†probirrana@gmail.com

1 Introduction

Recent global fits [15, 17, 18, 19, 30] of the pairwise mixing angles [11], appearing in U_{PMNS}, yield the 3σ ranges $31^0 < \theta_{12} < 36^0$, $36^0 < \theta_{23} < 55^0$ and $7.2^0 < \theta_{13} < 10^0$. On the other hand it is established [18, 19] that $7.00 < \Delta_{21}(10^5\ eV^2) < 8.09$ and $2.195 < [\Delta_{32}(10^3\ eV^2) > 0] < 2.625$ or $-2.649 < [\Delta_{32}(10^3\ eV^2) < 0] < -2.242$, where $\Delta_{ij} = |m_{\nu i}|^2 - |m_{\nu j}|^2$ and m_i, $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ are neutrino mass eigenvalues. Moreover, cosmological observations, strengthened by recent data from the PLANCK satellite, claim [27] that $\sum_i |m_{\nu i}| < 0.23\ eV$. Let U_t be the unitary transformation that diagonalizes the hermitian squared mass matrix $M_t^\dagger M_t$ in the flavor basis of a fermion of type t. Then U_u, U_d, U_ℓ can all be taken to show a hierarchical pattern, whereas U_ν seems governed by a different principle.

2 Perturbation theory of neutrino states

Let us henceforth use the superscript zero everywhere to denote the TBM limit. Suppose, in this limit, we choose a basis with mass diagonal charged leptons. Let us also encapsulate neutrino masses and mixing angles in the complex symmetric Majorana mass matrix $M_{\nu f} = U_\nu^* M_\nu U_\nu^\dagger$ in the flavor basis. The TBM pattern obtains with $\theta_{12}^0 = \sin^{-1}\sqrt{1/3} \sim 35.3^\circ$, $\theta_{23}^0 = \sin^{-1}\sqrt{1/2} = 45^\circ$ and $\theta_{13}^0 = 0$. The measurement of a significantly nonzero value of θ_{13} has been a major experimental advance recently [1, 2, 6, 10].

We add small general perturbations to the TBM limits of hermitian squared mass matrices $M_\ell{}^\dagger M_\ell$ and $M_{\nu f}^\dagger M_{\nu f}$. We characterize them [14] by a set of small parameters $\{\epsilon^{\nu,\ell}\}$. All members of the subset $\{\epsilon^\nu\}$ in the neutrino sector are taken to be typically of magnitude $\sim s_{13} \equiv \sin\theta_{13} \sim 0.16$, i.e. of the order of 16% (or thereabouts) of the unperturbed quantities.

In the TBM limit [7, 8, 9, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27], one has

$$U_\nu^{0\dagger}\ M_{\nu f}^0{}^\dagger M_{\nu f}^0\ U_\nu^0 = \text{diag}\ (|m_{\nu 1}^0|^2, |m_{\nu 2}^0|^2, |m_{\nu 3}^0|^2), \tag{1}$$

where

$$U_\nu^0 = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2/3} & \sqrt{1/3} & 0 \\ -\sqrt{1/6} & \sqrt{1/3} & \sqrt{1/2} \\ \sqrt{1/6} & -\sqrt{1/3} & \sqrt{1/2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

The normalized eigenvectors of $M_{\nu f}^0{}^\dagger M_{\nu f}^0$ are the columns of U_ν^0[12, 13, 20, 22, 31, 32]. With the perturbation added, $M_\ell = M_\ell^0 + M_\ell'$ and

$$M_\ell^\dagger M_\ell = U_\ell^\dagger M_{\ell f}^\dagger M_{\ell f} U_\ell. \tag{3}$$

Here $M^0_\ell = M^0_{\ell f}$ and $M'_\ell = U^\dagger_\ell M'_{\ell f} U$. We similarly decompose $M_{\nu f}$ into two parts; $M_{\nu f} = M^0_{\nu f} + M'_{\nu f}$, where $M^0_{\nu f}$ obeys the TBM conditions while $M'_{\nu f}$ violates them. Retaining only terms linear in the elements of $M'_{\ell f}$ and $M'_{\nu f}$, the ith eigenvectors of $M^\dagger_{\nu f} M_{\nu f}$ on one hand and of $M^\dagger_{\ell f} M_{\ell f}$ on the other can be written in a compact notation with the perturbation parameters $\epsilon^{\nu,\ell}_{ik}$ (for $i,k = 1,2,3$) as

$$|\psi^{\nu,\ell}_i\rangle_f = |\psi^{0\nu,\ell}_i\rangle_f + \sum_{k\neq i} \epsilon^{\nu,\ell}_{ik} |\psi^{0\nu,\ell}_k\rangle_f + O(\epsilon^2). \tag{4}$$

$$\epsilon^{\nu,\ell}_{ik} = -\epsilon^{\nu,\ell^*}_{ki} = (|m^0_{\nu,\ell i}|^2 - |m^0_{\nu,\ell k}|^2)^{-1} p^{\nu,\ell}_{ki}, \tag{5}$$

$$p^{\nu,\ell}_{ik} = \langle\psi^{0\nu,\ell}_i| {M^0_{\nu,\ell}}^\dagger M'_{\nu,\ell} + {M'_{\nu,\ell}}^\dagger M^0_{\nu,\ell} |\psi^{0\nu,\ell}_k\rangle. \tag{6}$$

Note that (5) and (6) have been written in the mass basis utilizing the fact that $\epsilon^{\nu,\ell}_{ik}$ and $p^{\nu,l}_{ik}$ are the same in either basis. On the other hand, the LHS of (4) for $i = 1,2,3$ can be identified with the three corresponding columns of $U_{\nu,\ell}$, i.e.

$$U_{\nu,\ell} = (|\psi^{\nu,\ell}_1\rangle_f \ |\psi^{\nu,\ell}_2\rangle_f \ |\psi^{\nu,\ell}_3\rangle_f). \tag{7}$$

Let us define the Majorana phase matrix[29] $K = \text{diag.}(1, e^{i\alpha_{21}/2}, e^{i\alpha_{32}/2})$. Then

$$U_{PMNS} = U^\dagger_\ell U_\nu K. \tag{8}$$

The RHS of (8) can be identified with the form of U_{PMNS} in the PDG convention [11]. The Majorana phase matrix cancels out in the above identification. Moreover, one is led to four independent constraints[14]:

$$\text{Im } \epsilon^\nu_{12} = O(\epsilon^2), \tag{9}$$

$$\text{Im } (\epsilon^\nu_{13} - \sqrt{2}\epsilon^\nu_{23}) = O(\epsilon^2), \tag{10}$$

$$\text{Im } \epsilon^l_{23} = O(\epsilon^2), \tag{11}$$

$$\text{Im } (\epsilon^l_{12} - \epsilon^l_{13}) = O(\epsilon^2). \tag{12}$$

In addition, the following expressions[1], which are linear in the ϵ parameters, emerge for the three measurable deviants from tribimaximal mixing:

$$c_{12} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} - s_{12}\right) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\ \epsilon^\nu_{12} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}\left(\epsilon^l_{12} - \epsilon^l_{13}\right), \tag{13}$$

$$c_{23} - s_{23} = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\left(\epsilon^\nu_{13} - \sqrt{2}\ \epsilon^\nu_{23}\right) - \sqrt{2}\ \epsilon^l_{23}, \tag{14}$$

$$s_{13}\ e^{i\delta_{CP}} = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\ \left(\sqrt{2}\ \epsilon^\nu_{13} + \epsilon^\nu_{23}\right) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\epsilon^l_{12} + \epsilon^l_{13}\right). \tag{15}$$

[1]Note that $\sqrt{2}\ c_{12} + s_{12} = \sqrt{3} + O(\epsilon^2)$ and $c_{23} + s_{23} = \sqrt{2} + O(\epsilon^2)$ are automatic

Let us now take the perturbing mass matrices for neutrinos and charged leptons, with respective complex mass dimensional parameters $\mu_{ij} = \mu_{ji}$ and λ_{ij}, as

$$M'_{\nu f} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{11} & \mu_{12} & \mu_{13} \\ \mu_{12} & \mu_{22} & \mu_{23} \\ \mu_{13} & \mu_{23} & \mu_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \quad M'_{\ell f} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{11} & \lambda_{12} & \lambda_{13} \\ \lambda_{21} & \lambda_{22} & \lambda_{23} \\ \lambda_{31} & \lambda_{32} & \lambda_{33} \end{pmatrix} = M'_\ell + O(\epsilon^2) \tag{16}$$

Eqn. (5) and Eqn. (6) lead to

$$\epsilon^l_{12} = (m_e^{0\,2} - m_\mu^{0\,2})^{-1}\ (m^0_\mu \lambda_{21} + m^0_e \lambda^*_{12}), \tag{17}$$

$$\epsilon^l_{23} = (m_\mu^{0\,2} - m_\tau^{0\,2})^{-1}\ (m^0_\tau \lambda_{32} + m^0_\mu \lambda^*_{23}), \tag{18}$$

$$\epsilon^l_{13} = (m_e^{0\,2} - m_\tau^{0\,2})^{-1}\ (m^0_\tau\ \lambda_{31} + m^0_e \lambda^*_{13}). \tag{19}$$

Because of the hierarchical nature of charged lepton masses, (11) and (12) can only be satisfied, without unnatural cancellations, by $\lambda_{12}, \lambda_{21}, \lambda_{13}, \lambda_{31}, \lambda_{32}$ and λ_{23} all being real to order ϵ. That immediately implies

$$\text{Im}\ \epsilon^l_{12} = O(\epsilon^2) = \text{Im}\ \epsilon^l_{13}, \tag{20}$$

$$\tan\delta_{CP} = \frac{3\ \text{Im}\ \epsilon^\nu_{23} + O(\epsilon^2)}{\text{Re}\ [\sqrt{2}\ \epsilon^\nu_{13} + \epsilon^\nu_{23}] - \sqrt{3/2}\ \text{Re}\ [\epsilon^l_{12} + \epsilon^l_{13}] + O(\epsilon^2)}, \tag{21}$$

$$J = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\ \text{Im}\ \epsilon^\nu_{23} + O(\epsilon^2). \tag{22}$$

For neutrinos, the relevant off-diagonal elements of M'_ν are

$$(M'_\nu)_{12} = \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}}(2\mu_{11} + \mu_{12} - \mu_{13} - \mu_{22} + 2\mu_{23} - \mu_{33}), \tag{23}$$

$$(M'_\nu)_{23} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(\mu_{12} + \mu_{13} + \mu_{22} - \mu_{33}), \tag{24}$$

$$(M'_\nu)_{13} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(\mu_{12} + \mu_{13} - \frac{1}{2}\mu_{22} + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{33}). \tag{25}$$

Each RHS above is nonzero if all the TBM conditions are violated by $M'_{\nu f}$[14]. It is now convenient to define

$$\Delta^0_{ij} \equiv |m^0_{\nu i}|^2 - |m^0_{\nu j}|^2, \quad a^\mp_{ij} \equiv m^0_{\nu i} \mp m^0_{\nu j}. \tag{26}$$

Then (5), (6), (23), (25) and (24) enable us to write ϵ^ν_{ik} in terms of the following combinations of elements of $M'_{\nu f}$:

$$6\sqrt{2}\ \Delta^0_{12} \begin{pmatrix} \text{i Im}\ \epsilon^\nu_{12} \\ \text{Re}\ \epsilon^\nu_{12} \end{pmatrix} = a^{\mp *}_{21}\ (2\mu_{11} + \mu_{12} - \mu_{13} - \mu_{22} + 2\mu_{23} - \mu_{33}) \mp c.c., \tag{27}$$

$$2\sqrt{6}\ \Delta^0_{23}\begin{pmatrix}\text{i Im }\epsilon^\nu_{23}\\ \text{Re }\epsilon^\nu_{23}\end{pmatrix} = a^{\mp *}_{32}(\mu_{12}+\mu_{13}+\mu_{22}-\mu_{33})\mp c.c., \tag{28}$$

$$2\sqrt{3}\ \Delta^0_{13}\begin{pmatrix}\text{i Im }\epsilon^\nu_{13}\\ \text{Re }\epsilon^\nu_{13}\end{pmatrix} = a^{\mp *}_{31}(\mu_{12}+\mu_{13}-\frac{1}{2}\mu_{22}+\frac{1}{2}\mu_{33})\mp c.c. \tag{29}$$

3 Implications and conclusion

We can discuss [14] the implications of (27), (28), (29) in ongoing and forthcoming experiments[3, 4, 5, 16, 24, 28, 33]. Once again, in the absence of unnatural cancellations, (9) and (27) would require $2\mu_{11}+\mu_{12}-\mu_{13}-\mu_{22}+2\mu_{23}-\mu_{33}$ and $m^0_{\nu 2}$ to be real; the latter constrains the Majorana phase [11] α^0_{21} to equal 0 or π in the TBM limit. These statements are valid neglecting $O(\epsilon^2)$ terms. Furthermore, (10), (28) and (29) would require one of the following two conditions. **Either,** one must have **condition 1:** $m^0_{\nu 1} = m^0_{\nu 2}$, meaning $m^0_{\nu 1} = |m^0_{\nu 2}|$ plus $\alpha^0_{21} = 0$, and $\mu_{22} = \mu_{33}$ in which case, $\sqrt{2}$ Re ϵ^ν_{23} = Re $\epsilon^\nu_{13} + O(\epsilon^2)$ and then, from (14), $c_{23} - s_{23} = -\sqrt{2}\ \epsilon^l_{23} + O(\epsilon^2)$,i.e, $s_{23} = (1/\sqrt{2})(1+\epsilon^l_{23}) + O(\epsilon^2)$; the latter implies via (14) and (18) that any deviation from maximality in the atmospheric neutrino mixing angle θ_{23} must come solely from the 2-3 off-diagonal element in the charged lepton mass perturbation M'_l and is expected to be small since ϵ^l_{23} is scaled by $(m_\tau)^{-1}$, cf. (18) . **Or**, what becomes necessary is **condition 2:** $m^0_{\nu 3} - m^0_{\nu 1}$, $m^0_{\nu 3} - m^0_{\nu 2}$ as well as $\mu_{12}+\mu_{13}$ and $\mu_{22}-\mu_{33}$ have to be real; this means that the Majorana phase α^0_{21} and α^0_{32} in the TBM limit are 0 or π and ϵ^ν_{23} is real, in which case, by virtue of (21) as well as (22), sin $\delta_{CP} = O(\epsilon^2)$ and $J = O(\epsilon^2)$ so that, any observable CP-violation in neutrino oscillation experiments would vanish to the lowest order of TBM violating perturbations. This is our statement on two alternatives one of which is obligatory. Thus $|s_{23} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|$ has to be significantly less than s_{13} (though we are unable to make a precise prediction) or alternatively $\sin\delta_{CP}$ as well as J would be unobservably small.

References

[1] K. Abe et al; Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 181802 (2011).

[2] Y. Abe et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 131801 (2012).

[3] C. Adams et al, arXiv:1307.7335 [hep-ph].

[4] S. K. Agarwalla, S. Prakash and S. Uma Sankar, arXiv:1301.2574 [hep-ph].

[5] S. K. Agarwalla et al. arXiv:1312.6520 [hep-ph].

[6] J. K. Ahn et.al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 191802 (2012).

[7] G. Atlarelli and F. Feruglio, New J. Phys. **6**, 106 (2006).

[8] G. Altarelli, F. Feruglio, L. Merlo and E. Stamou, JHEP **1208**, 012 (2012).

[9] G. Altarelli, S. Feruglio and L. Merlo, Fortsch. Phys. **61**, 507 (2013).

[10] F. P. An et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 171803 (2012).

[11] J. Beringer et. al. (PDG), Phys. Rev. **D86**, 010001 (2012).

[12] D. Borah, Nucl. Phys. **B876**, 575 (2013).

[13] B. Brahmachari and A. Raychaudhuri, Phys. Rev. **D86**, **R**051302 (2012).

[14] B. Brahmachari, P. Roy, JHEP **1502**, 135 (2015).

[15] F. Capozzi, G. L. Fogli, E. Lisi, A. Marrone, D. Montanino and A. Palazzo, arXiv:1312.2878 [hep-ph].

[16] A. Chatterjee, P. Ghosal, S. Goswami and S. K. Raut, arXiv:1302.1370 [hep-ph].

[17] A. de Gouvea et al, arXiv:1310.4340 [hep-ph];

[18] D. V. Forero, M. Tortola and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. **D86**, 073012 (2012).

[19] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, J. Salvado and T. Schwetz, JHEP 1212, 123 (2012).

[20] L. J. Hall and G. G. Ross, JHEP **1311**, 091 (2013).

[21] P. F. Harrison, D. H. Perkins and W. G. Scott, Phys. Lett. **B530**, 167 (2002).

[22] X. He and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. **D84**, 053004 (2011).

[23] D. Hernandez and A. Y Smirnov, Phys. Rev. **D 86**, 003014 (2012); *ibid* **D87**, 053005 (2013).

[24] International Design Study of the Neutrino Factory, http://www.ids-nf.org

[25] S. F. King and C. Luhn, JHEP 11099, 042 (2011).

[26] S. King and C. Luhn, Rept. Prog. Phys. **T6**, 006201 (2013).

[27] J. Lesgourgues and S. Pastor, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2012**, 608515 (2012).

[28] P. A. N. Machado, H. Minakata, H. Nunokawa and R. R. Funchal, arXiv:1307.3248 [hep-ph].

[29] R. N. Mohapatra and A. Y. Smirnov, Ann. Rev Nucl Part. Sci **56**, 569 (2006).

[30] S. Parke, arXiv:1310.5992 [hep-ph].

[31] S. Pramanik and A. Raychaudhuri, Phys. Rev. **D88**, 093009 (2013).

[32] D. A. Sierra, I. de M. Varzielas and E. Houet, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 09309 (2013).

[33] A. Stahl et al, Report No. CERN-SPSC-2012-021;